

Government Orders

• (1205)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Negatived on division.

Motion No. 3 negatived.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gilles Loiselle (for the Minister of Justice, Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

Mr. Loiselle (for the Minister of Justice) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I suppose that anytime there is an amendment to the Criminal Code and I have the honour to speak in the House then I would say it is a pleasure to speak. It truly is a pleasure to talk at the third reading stage of this bill.

I begin by thanking hon. members on all sides of the House for making it possible for this bill to get to third reading because I do believe that it is an important step forward in the Criminal Code. It is an important step forward for individuals who fear for their lives and their safety because of the unwanted attention that is sometimes directed at them.

I am pleased that the members of this House have agreed to move this piece of legislation. This is legislation that I think is very helpful and very important to children involved with the criminal justice system and children who are the victims of child molesters. There is considerable reason for this House and its members to be proud of the work they have done on this legislation.

A number of individuals and groups came before the legislative committee and indicated that they wished there were more time for consent. I would be less than honest if I said that I wished there were more time for consent. I can say that we are not bringing this legislation forward to be miserable or not to have a full discussion on this. There are certain realities we face. Among all the things and the pressures facing the minister, the government and parliamentarians, the process has been a reasonable one.

It was just three months ago that I was in Toronto and participated in various workshops concerning the prevention of crime. I can say that there were individuals there and I am sorry I did not take down their names and with what they were affiliated. However, they raised the matter of an anti-stalking legislation and indicated the things that we could be doing at the federal level to enhance public safety and to make better laws in this country. Certainly anti-stalking was one of them.

I mentioned at the report stage that I was the recipient of a petition in my own riding of Niagara Falls in which over 6,000 people, mainly women, said: "Look, this is an urgent problem. Parliament should bring forward legislation in this area".

I wish there had been lots of time for the parliamentary committee to study this. It was done in a couple of weeks. I do not agree that the clause-by-clause consideration was only three hours. I remember being there for most of the afternoon. We went from 3.30 p.m. to about 6 p.m. and then we went again for several hours in the evening. I can say that I and other members were prepared to come back the following morning as well if there had been other amendments or other discussions.

Ms. Langan: It was only three hours for clause by clause.

Mr. Nicholson: Three hours? My own recollection of it is that we were there in the afternoon and the evening. If hon. members want to discuss it further, I wish we had the summer. I wish we could bring in people and everything else.

• (1210)

Having said that, I think this is good legislation. I believe it was well crafted and the committee process was a good one. I respectfully disagree with individuals